
Sent: 5/04/2021 10:26:37 PM
Subject: Online Submission

05/04/2021

MR Paul Giunti
67 Binalong AVE
Allambie Heights NSW 2100
paul.giunti@gmail.com

RE: DA2020/1691 - 4 Southern Cross Way ALLAMBIE HEIGHTS NSW 2100

Attention of: Planning Officer Thomas Burns
Northern Beaches Council, Planning and Development
Civic Centre, 725 Pittwater Road, Dee Why, NSW 2099

Monday 5th April 2021
Regarding: Development Application DA2020/1691
4 Southern Cross Way, Allambie Heights, NSW 2100.

Dear Mr Burns,

We are writing to object to the development application DA2020/1691.

We have gone through the plans of the proposed development to be constructed directly behind our property.

We have taken considerable effort to understand the application and examine a number of issues where it does not meet the development approval requirements and is incongruent with the regulations.

From what we can assess, the documentation is incomplete, ambiguous and does not represent the significant overbearing scale and impact the development will have on our right to principal private open space and access to solar amenity. The issues raised below will have an enormous impact on our privacy and enjoyment of our home.

The first and most significant issue is that the submission is incomplete, has flaws in the detail and is ambiguous.

Our main concerns are as follows:

1. The primary dwelling of the development is a large scale three-storey building, which to my understanding for the R2 zoning is not an appropriate development and should be a maximum of two storeys.
2. The height of the primary dwelling is misrepresented from the incorrect datum and the 8.5-metre height of this dwelling is ambiguously shown from the pre-excavation ground level, not revised to the bottom of the post-excavation ground level. Hence the dwelling appears to exceed 10 metres in height, which far exceeds the allowed regulations.
3. The additional dwellings:
 - a. The second and third dwelling drawings do not show a full representation of their impact and position to all the boundary fences. The drawings do not seem to include overall heights and most noticeably how the dwellings will be positioned against and impact the rear boundary

fence, which will create a significant breach of our privacy with direct line of sight into our primary private space, directly onto our pool deck and straight into our main living and dining area. We feel the drawings do not show the exact height of the floor level and large windows of these dwellings above the line of our fence, with a view from our property. We have had a couple of drawings created to show an idea of this impact on the expected line of sight, that we include in our submission.

b. It includes two additional dwellings, one listed as a granny flat and one as a home office. It will be very easy for the third dwelling, "home office", to be adapted to another studio flat, as it includes plumbing that can be extended to use for a kitchen and shower room. It seems like this home office is a misrepresentation that could easily have been included in the primary dwelling, therefore making this an attempt to create a secondary studio flat as soon as approval has been granted, to by-pass the "system".

c. They have not complied with the rule of one secondary dwelling and therefore with the addition of an "office" have clearly exceeded the allowed footprint of a secondary dwelling at well over 60sq/m.

d. Page 21 of the master plans is ambiguous and misrepresents the overlooking nature into our backyard. This drawing will misguide any assessment from the true nature of the impact the three dwellings will have on our privacy. Most noticeably the placement of some existing trees, that include their overall height, in the diagram, which are nowhere near our fence, nowhere in the line of sight from our property to theirs and therefore should not be included, as they do not obstruct any viewpoints from the property in question. This drawing is misleading and should be re-submitted.

4. All proposed dwellings will impact on our rights to solar amenity. The shadow diagrams do not include the expected shadow of the second and third dwellings. We would like to see this and the impact they will have on our property.

We have commenced work with a consultant to understand the impact of such a large scale development of three dwellings, listing our initial concerns above. In addition, we would like to also raise a few other issues:

1. The expected excavation seems to be extremely ambitious.

a. Our understanding is that the depth of expected excavation exceeds what is an acceptable depth.

b. Our property including the pool is attached to the same bedrock, therefore any vibrations that come from the excavation work, could damage our pool and/or house foundations.

c. To have our pool or home damaged as a result of this work, with young children living in our home, would severely impact our families safety.

d. We would like to understand how this excavation work will be managed and monitored for compliance, including hours of this type of work. Bearing in mind that most surrounding homes now contain residents who work from home.

2. The proposed "white feather" tree/plant to be place on the back fence, near our pool will cause us many issues, and would better suit a tree/plant that will not impact our property so heavily, one with little to no shedding of leaves into our swimming pool. Please can we understand why a white feather plant has been suggested for this location, right on the fence that borders a swimming pool?

Finally, we would like to state that we are not against property development, and understand the house requires a knock-down rebuild. However, the scale of this development seems to be unreasonable and in breach of several regulations in place and is also not within keeping of the area of low-density housing that attracts families to enjoy the quiet suburb.

We would like to raise these serious concerns with you as you assess the proposed development.

With regards,

Paul and Rachel Giunti
67 Binalong Ave, Allambie Heights